

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending with Claims 1, 6 and 8 being independent claims.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, due to, in each of independent Claims 1, 6 and 8, the limitation “an electrical connection path . . . includes the conductive coil spring” allegedly being unsupported in the specification.

The Examiner further alleges the coil spring being “electrically conductive” as new matter.

The Examiner also alleges that the term “conductive” relative to the coil spring could have potentially meant expanding/compression movement.

Regarding the first allegation (against the limitation “an electrical connection path . . . includes the conductive coil spring” in each of independent Claims 1, 6 and 8), the specification distinctively cites in the ‘Field of the Invention’ section “The present invention relates to . . . a folder type terminal, in which grounds formed in a main body and in a folder are electrically connected to each other” [emphasis added]. When an element is generally described as conductive, the description could be broadly deduced for being thermally conductive, acoustically conductive, vibrationally conductive, electrically conductive, and so on. However, reading through the present application in the context described in the ‘Field of the Invention’ section, a person skilled in the art understands, within the scope of the present application, the conductivity of the elements cited in each of the independent claims, e.g. Claim 1, such as a conductive hinge housing, a conductive coil spring, a conductive contact pin, and a conductive hinge dummy, without specific conductivity cited, adequately means electrical conductivity. Further, for example when reading Claim 1, before and after citing the elements of a conductive hinge housing, a conductive coil spring, a conductive contact pin, and a conductive hinge dummy, Claim 1 also repeatedly introduces the electrical conductivity in the recitations “a hinge device for electrically connecting” and “a conductive hinge dummy electrically connected.” The specification also discloses the main body 210 and the folder 250 are pivotably connected by a hinge device 300 comprising the conductive coil spring 340 (FIGs. 2 and 4).

Therefore, the specification sufficiently supports the limitation “an electrical connection path . . . includes the conductive coil spring” in each of independent Claims 1, 6 and 8.

Regarding the second allegation of the coil spring being “electrically conductive” as new matter, a person skilled in the art, reading through the present application, would understand the conductive coil spring in each of independent Claims 1, 6 and 8 being electrically conductive. Therefore, the coil spring being “electrically conductive” is not new subject matter.

Regarding the third allegation that the term “conductive” relative to the coil spring could have potentially meant expanding/compression movement, a person skilled in the art, reading through the present application without specific citation of any particular conductivity, would understand the conductive coil spring in each of independent Claims 1, 6 and 8 being electrically conductive. The term “coil spring” by itself implies expanding/compression movement. The term “conductive coil spring” indicates characteristic being more than expanding/compression movement but also conductivity, and in the context of the present application, electrical conductivity.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims herein, namely Claims 1-8, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant’s attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard, Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
(516) 228-3565 - Tel
(516) 228-8475 - Fax

PJF/TCS/mk